



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

bureau. In accordance with Article 23 of the convention, providing for the appointment by each signatory power of persons of known competency in questions of international law as arbitrators, I have appointed as members of this court the Hon. Benjamin Harrison of Indiana, ex-President of the United States; the Hon. Melville W. Fuller of Illinois, Chief Justice of the United States; the Hon. John W. Griggs of New Jersey, Attorney-General of the United States; and the Hon. George Gray of Delaware, a judge of the circuit court of the United States."

Information from other countries shows that the governments consider the constitution of the permanent court of arbitration a matter of the very highest importance, and only men of the first rank are being appointed members. We have already mentioned in a previous issue the names of the men chosen by the Russian and the Dutch governments. On the 7th of December it was announced from London that the Queen had appointed as the British members of the court Lord Pauncefoot, ambassador at Washington; Sir Edward Malet, late British ambassador to Germany; Right Hon. Sir Edward Fry, a former lord justice of the high Court of Appeal; and Prof. John Westlake, professor of international law at Cambridge University.

On the same date it was made public that the Austrian government had named as its members in the court Count Von Schoelborn, Dr. Lammasch, and from Hungary Count Albert Apponyi and Dr. Szalay, former minister of justice. Dr. Lammasch is a professor of high standing in the University of Vienna, and Count Apponyi has been for some time a prominent worker in the Interparliamentary Peace Union. The government of Denmark has chosen, as its representative in the tribunal, Dr. Matzen, professor of law at the University of Copenhagen. Whether Denmark will choose other members is not stated. Dr. Bingner, president of the German high court, Herr von Frantzius, councilor of the foreign office and of the high court, and Professor von Bar of the University of Goettingen have been appointed to the court by the German government. These are all men of the first rank in German juridic circles. France has chosen men of equal eminence, viz., Léon Bourgeois, president of the French Commission to the Hague Conference, one of the most eminent of living French statesmen, Mr. d'Estournelles de Constant, also a delegate to the Hague Conference, a member of the French Chamber of Deputies, Professor Renault, of the Law Faculty of Paris, who was likewise a member of the Hague Conference, and Mr. Delaboulaye.

Further announcements we have not seen at the present writing. The appointments already made render it clear that the governments which took part in the Hague Conference take the matter with entire seriousness, and mean to make the court of arbitration a body worthy of the highest confidence of the world.

It will not be many months until word will be flashed along the wires and cables that some controversy between two nations, perhaps the Alaskan boundary dispute or the question of Chinese indemnity, has been carried up to the bar of this court, and the august tribunal, with less noise than it takes to make a single Maxim gun, will have begun its majestic and mighty course.

However inauspicious may be the commencement of the twentieth century in some respects, it is certainly a source of the greatest encouragement that it opens with the establishment of this high court of nations, manned with the best juridic talent of the time, whose existence and work, it is perfectly judicious to say, will in time change the entire spirit and course of international affairs and deliver us from the chaos and anarchy which now prevail to such an unfortunate extent between the nations.

Mahanism.

Captain A. T. Mahan's position on the subject of war, while not altogether unique, is put forth with enough of his individuality in it to entitle it to be called by his name. Briefly characterized, it is a refined, abstract, idealized gospel of force. It is expounded by him with a grace and elegance of diction, — free from all that is coarse and materialistic in expression, touched at times with a lulling obscurity of phraseology, — sufficient to deceive the very elect among peacemakers. What does he teach?

With him all arguments lead to the necessity, the sacredness of force. War he considers remedial, and hence its instruments, like those of the surgeon, must be of the highest perfection. There are times when all other means are of no avail, when righteousness and human good can be advanced only by the rifle and the Long Tom. In the redemption of the world, so far as this depends on states, force is not only the last argument, but an instrument to be kept always polished and ready. He fears too much arbitration. No nation must bind itself to obligatory arbitration, for that would prevent it at times from being judge in its own cause, and from employing the sacred trust of force which God has put into its hands to be used absolutely according to its own judgment.

In a number of recent articles Captain Mahan has set forth these views. At the close of the Hague Conference in 1899, he wrote for the *North American Review* a long article the main purpose of which was, not to advocate reduction of armaments, or even arbitration of international differences, as one might have expected from a member of that Conference, but to exalt the virtues of force, to plead for its retention as a sacred trust, and to prevent arbitration from going too far.

On the breaking out and development of the Chinese troubles another article comes from his pen,

published in the last November *North American Review*. In spite of many excellent utterances in regard to the proper treatment of China, this article runs straight to the goal which is always before his eyes. Present Asiatic conditions, he pleads, demand a larger and more efficient United States navy. Without this, the nation cannot fulfill the duty in international affairs assigned to it by a beneficent Providence. The fight for the commerce of the Eastern Asiatic regions is on, and we shall be left out in the cold, empty-handed and helpless, unless we have an adequate navy with which to maintain our position in the fray of greed.

More recently still, before the Episcopal Church-Congress at Providence, Captain Mahan has further developed his ideas, this time from the Christian point of view. He takes the position, seemingly with all candor, that war is proved to be right because its supporters are many of them professed Christians, while some of its extreme opponents at the present time are atheists and agnostics, like John Morley, Frederick Harrison and Herbert Spencer, — who, one would think, are only the stones crying out because the church has let the world stop its mouth. War, he argues, though an evil like amputation, is not evil, that is, not morally wrong. Only when used for an unjust object is it wicked. In itself it is morally characterless. War, again, is righteous because, as he holds, it is a remedy for greater evils — moral evils. In such cases it is an unrighteous thing to abstain from war.

In this Providence address he again exhibits his distrust of obligatory arbitration, because, forsooth, in the present complex relations of peoples it is impossible to get impartial arbitrators! He illustrates by the South African War and the Hayes-Tilden presidential contest. In the latter case he virtually says, if the illustration means anything, that it would have been better for the two great parties to fight out the contest on the bloody field than to submit the case to so prejudiced a tribunal; in the former, that the horrible struggle which is desolating South Africa is more likely to secure justice than any solution which would probably have been rendered by arbitrators voluntarily selected by both sides from "the whole world which seethed with bias"!

Mr. Mahan supports his contention that our Lord permitted and even authorized the use of force, — that employment of force which constitutes war, — by the case of the driving out of the sacrilegious Jews from the temple, and by the exhortation on one occasion to sell the coat and buy a sword — occurrences the evident symbolical character of which is too evident to need argument. More hard-pressed still for arguments must one be who supports his thesis, as Captain Mahan does, by Christ's saying: "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight," etc. According to his interpreta-

tion, developed in the Providence speech, Christians in their religious life and work must be forgiving, non-resistant and swordless, but in the performance of their duties as citizens of the state they may arm themselves, fight and slaughter their fellowmen on occasion! He does not attempt to tell us where the Kingdom of God ends in a man's life and the kingdom of this world begins, in which another set of principles and sentiments govern him. This division of Christian life into two spheres, one religious, the other secular, governed by different and contradictory principles and sentiments, has done more to discredit Christianity than any other bit of religious sophistry. It has been the hot-bed of Christian hypocrites, and one of the chief causes of scepticism.

The errors of Mahanism are many and grievous. We can only formulate them in a few general statements.

It is contrary at every point to the whole life, spirit and instruction of Jesus. Only by the most casuistic use of a few scattered sayings of the Master, whose natural import is exactly the other way, can any support for war be wrung from his teachings. One has only to lay any war in its concrete reality alongside the New Testament to see the utter incompatibility of the two.

It abstracts war from all its coarse and hideous realism. Captain Mahan, in his refined idealization of force, ignores almost entirely the concrete horrors of war, the filthiness, hate, uncontrollable fury, moral degradation, brutalization, lying, etc., without which, in greater or less degree, war never takes place. He talks about the use of force in war as one might speak of the employment of a crowbar, derrick, pulley, elevator or locomotive, where force, as in a thousand other ways, is used beneficently and righteously. The chief factor in war is not the material force employed, but the men who use it and the sentiments and feelings with which they fight, — the anger, vindictiveness and fury with which they shoot, stab and tear in pieces others made in their own likeness. There is no Mahanian idealism in the hell of battle, where mad, raging men do each other to horrible deaths.

Mahanism is, therefore, totally wrong in treating war as a characterless instrument, acquiring its righteousness or wickedness from the purpose for which it is used. If there is anything into the face of which one may look and intuitively pronounce it evil, it is war. It is not a matter to be judged at all by its motives and ends; it must be judged by what it is in itself. Mahanism is the baldest assertion that the end justifies the means, however brutal and fiendish.

Again, when analyzed to the bottom, Mahanism is nothing more or less than refined barbarism. If the principle that a nation ought to refuse to commit itself to obligatory arbitration and reserve the right

to use force at its own discretion were applied to civil life, every individual would become judge in his own cause, the "right of the fist," as the Germans call it, would be restored, and civilization, with its organized system of civil law, would be broken up. There is no more ground for barbarism in international affairs than in common social life. Nations are just as interdependent in their relations as individuals. No nation in controversy ought to be judge of what justice demands.

Once more, Mahanism exalts brute force above reason and moral forces, and declares it to be the final and supreme factor in civilization, the *sine qua non*, without which certain great moral accomplishments can never be expected, without which the world cannot get up to the highest heights of Christian righteousness. What is this but utter lack of faith in humanity? Is it the brute that is left in man which is to lift him? Captain Mahan confesses, however, with apparent unconsciousness of the contradiction, that the "sword has no power over intellect or moral assent." He does not tell us by what process, then, it can cure moral evils in society.

Finally, Mahanism, in its effort to give war a remedial character, overlooks entirely the multitudinous brood of moral evils which war always brings forth. It ignores the evils of great armaments, the crushing and degrading burdens of taxation imposed by war and preparations for war, the deplorable moral deterioration which it produces in society in the way of vice and lawlessness, the international hatred, suspicion and contempt which it begets, and the peril of new war which constantly follows in the wake of war. To talk of war being remedial is like proposing to cure smallpox by new injections of the nasty poison into the blood. From a professional militarist's point of view a strong navy or a powerful army may be a grand and desirable thing, but from the point of view of the national security, peace and general prosperity in the long run, growing armaments on sea or land made to meet the necessities supposedly created by the bloated military establishments and ambitious policies of other powers are, instead of being remedies, themselves the cause of maladies as deep-seated and dangerous as ever afflict a nation.

Editorial Notes.

Prayer for
Peace.

The Evangelical Alliance of the United States (William E. Dodge, president, L. T. Chamberlain, secretary) have sent out an earnest and timely appeal to all Christians in the nation to devote the week from January 6 to 13, inclusive, to united prayer for the coming of God's Kingdom. For the 10th and 11th the subjects suggested for which prayer shall be offered are thus phrased:

"Thursday, prayer for right relations in Society and the nation, with the Golden Rule obeyed as between

man and man, and all social and political action guided by justice and goodwill,—the Christian ideal.

"Friday, prayer for all international relationships and all international action, that they may be based on the Christian principles which apply to the individual,—the reign of the Prince of Peace."

The Golden Rule obeyed between man and man, justice and goodwill observed in all social and political action, and Christian principles which apply to the individual extended to all international relations, would indeed inaugurate, or rather constitute, the reign of the Prince of Peace. Christians, now numbered by tens of millions, are deeply responsible for the delay of this reign. The objects here suggested by the Evangelical Alliance are worthy of their most earnest and united prayer not for a single week only, but all the year round. But there is something more important still. Behind the prayer ought to be a character in the Christians themselves corresponding to these great accomplishments for which they are urged to pray. Without this their prayer will be no prayer, but just simply empty words, which God cannot bless, which he veritably loathes. Christian men and women can promote the Kingdom of God in no other way so effectually and rapidly as by actually keeping the Golden Rule, the principles of justice and goodwill, everywhere themselves, and upholding its application in all social and international affairs. After making all due allowance, there is ample ground for the reproach now so often cast upon the church of Jesus Christ and its ministry, that it is one of the chief bulwarks of the war system, with its high-handedness, manifold injustices, its hate and moral loathsomeness. Let all ground for this reproach be removed, let Christian men and women, and Christian organizations of every kind, return in theory and practice to the simple spirit and teachings of their Master, and this very act will be a prayer which will open every window of heaven, and the Kingdom of God will come in like a sunburst of the morning.

South
Africa.

The breaking out anew of the war in South Africa is too serious either to be encouraging to English hope or gratifying to English pride. While Lord Roberts has been receiving an ovation and all sorts of military "honors" on his return to England, the Boers have been capturing British outposts and executing what seems to be a well-planned invasion into Cape Colony. The English forces have been unable so far either to capture these invading commandos or seriously to interfere with their operations. So serious has the situation become that guns have been landed from the warships at Cape Town, and General Kitchener has called for more mounted troops, and for five thousand men to guard the Rand